

THE GHOST WORD *DVĪHITIKĀ* AND THE DESCRIPTION OF FAMINES IN EARLY BUDDHIST LITERATURE

The word *dvīhitikā*, called an ‘obscure term’ in the Critical Pāli Dictionary¹ s.v. *Thita*, occurs only in one and the same formula, which is used to describe places where it is difficult for monks to get food because of famine:

(*Verañjā, Vajjī, Nālandā*) *dubbhikkhā hoti dvīhitikā setaṭṭhikā salākāvuttā na sukarā uñchena paggahena yāpetum*, Vin III 6, 18-20 = 7,6-8 = 15,6 foll. = 87,5-9 = IV 23,17 foll.; S IV 323,3 foll. (without: *na sukarā* . . .)²

‘(*Verañjā, Vajjī, Nālandā*) was short of almsfood, which was difficult to obtain; it was suffering from famine, and food tickets were issued’ (I. B. Horner).

The note attached to this translation (‘the meaning of these four stock-phrases is doubtful’) shows that the terms *dvīhitika*, *setaṭṭhika* and *salākāvutta* have been far from being understood since even before Buddhaghosa’s time, as will be shown later.

Among Pāli scholars of modern times, H. Kern seems to be the first to discuss *dvīhitika*.³ On the whole Kern follows the explanation given in the *aṭṭhakathā*, leaving open the choice between ‘to have doubts about the possibility of getting food’ (*dvi-thati*) and ‘to have difficulties in getting food’ (*dus-thati*). The PED quotes Kern but draws attention to *duhitika*, hesitantly translated by ‘infested with robbers’ and derived from the Sanskrit root *druh*. Quite a different suggestion was put forward by F.L. Woodward in his translation of the *Samyuttanikāya*: ‘I conjecture *du-vīhi-tikā* (where paddy grows badly)’ (*Kindred Sayings* IV 228 n. 1). Lastly the CPD offers a confusing rather than helpful discussion on *dvīhitika* s.vv. *ihati* and *Thā*.

In the *aṭṭhakathā* the term *dvīhitika* is commented on in the *Sāratthappakāsinī* and in the *Samantapāsādikā*. The latter offers a long and elaborate explanation, which shows very clearly that at the time of Buddhaghosa the meaning and the correct grammatical analysis had fallen into oblivion:

tattha dvīhitikā ti dvidhāpavattāthitikā. Thitam nāma iriyā: dvidhāpavattā cittairiyā cittāthā: ‘ettha lacchāma nu kho kiñci bhikkhamāna, na lacchāmā’ ti, ‘Jñitum vā sakkhissāma nu kho, no’ ti ayam ettha adhippāyo. atha vā: dvīhitikā ti dujītvikā. Thitam, Thā, iriyānam, pavattanam, jīvitan ti-ādāni padāni ekaṭhāni. tasmā dukkhena Thitam ettha pavattat ti dvīhitikā ti. ayam ettha padattho. Sp 174, 24-175, 1 = Sp (Be) 1 143, 21-27.⁴

‘Here *dvīhitikā* means: endeavour being exercised in two ways. Endeavour is movement: the movement of thinking, the endeavour of thinking is exercised in two ways: “Shall we get something when begging, shall we not get [anything]? Shall we be able to live or not?” This is meant here. Or: *dvīhitikā* means “difficult living”; endeavour, exertion, behavior, activity, life, etc. are words of the same meaning. Therefore *dvīhitikā* means “here the endeavour [for living] goes on with difficulty”. This is the meaning of the word here.’

In this alternative explanation Buddhaghosa assumes different meanings for both parts of the compound *dvīhitikā*: First it is split into *dvi*, supposed to stand for *dvidhā*, and *Thita* equivalent to *iriyā*. As *Thita*, *Thā*, and *iriyā* are to be understood as having the same or at least nearly the same meaning, it is difficult to assume that *iriyā* signifies ‘(good) conduct’, which is its usual meaning. It seems rather to be the agent noun of *iriyati* ‘to move, to live’. The second suggestion, to analyse *dvīhitikā* as *du(s)-Thitaka*, does not offer such difficulties.

That Sāriputta in the 12th century was embarrassed to a certain extent by Buddhaghosa’s commentary is evident from the fact that he found it necessary to take up the problem again, and also from what he has to say:

dvidhā pavattam Thitam ethā ti dvīhitikā ti majjhapadalopṭ-bāhiratthasamāso ‘yam iti dassento āha: dvidhāpavattāthitikā ti. Thanam Thitan ti Thitasaddo ‘yam bhāvasādhano ti āha: dvidhāpavattāthitikā ti. Thitam nāma iriyā ti. tattha iriyā ti kiriya. kassa pan’ esā kiriya ti āha: cittairiyā ti cittakiriya cittappayogo ti attho. ten’ evāha: cittāthā ti. katham pan’ ettha Thitassa dvidhāpavattā ti āha: ‘lacchāma nu kho’ ti ādi. tattha

*'lacchāma nu kho' ti idam duggatānām vasena vuttam
jīvitum vā sakkhissāma nu kho, no' ti idam pana issarānam
vasena vuttan ti veditabbam. bhikkhamāna ti yācamāna.
duhitikā ti pi pātho tatthāpi vuttanayen' ev' attho
veditabbo, dvisadassa hi dusaddādesenāyam niddeso hoti.
dukkham⁵ vā īhitam ettha na sakkā koci payogo sukhena
kātun ti duhitikā.⁵ dukkarājvitappayogā ti attho. dusadde
vā ukārassa vakāram katvā dvīhitikā ti ayam niddeso ti
āha: atha vā ti ādi, Sp-ṭ (Be) I 426, 5-18.*

'He [Buddhaghosa] says "dvidhāpavattātīhitikā" showing that *dvīhitikā* is a compound, in which the middle member is omitted, and which is an adjective, meaning "here endeavour is exercised in two ways." [The words] *Thana* and *īhita* [having the same meaning], [and] the word "endeavour" meaning "securing the existence", he says "endeavour" means "movement". Here "movement" means "activity". [Answering the question:] "Whose activity is it?" He says: "movement of thinking", which means activity of thinking, application of thinking. Therefore he says "endeavour of thinking". [Answering the question:] "How is it, that there is a twofold exertion of the endeavour?" He says: "Shall we get etc." Here "shall we get" is said with regard to the miserable people. "Shall we be able to live or not?" with regard to the rich, [thus] is the interpretation. Begging means "asking for". There is also the reading *duhitikā*. Here also the meaning has to be recognized according to what has been said above. For this is indicated by substituting the syllable *du* for the syllable *dvi*. Or: *duhitikā* means: "here endeavour is difficult, no undertaking can be done easily." The meaning is "where living is difficult to procure". He [Buddhaghosa] says "ātha vā" etc. indicating, that in the syllable *du* the sound *u* is changed into *va* optionally [which leads to] *dvīhitikā*'.

Considering *iriyā* as the equivalent of *kiriyā*, Sāriputta shows that the interpretation of *cittairiyā* etc. was already problematic in his time. Whether Buddhaghosa really had in mind different social groups, when talking about a double endeavour of thinking, is open to doubt. He probably rather thought of the monks considering the question, whether they would get any food at all first, and then asking themselves, whether or not they might be able to subsist on what they received. Sāriputta, however,

follows an older tradition. For Vajirabuddhi had already said: *lacchāma nu kho ti duggate sandhāya vuttam, sakkhissāma nu kho no ti samiddhe sandhāya*, Vjb (Be) 56, 3 foll. "shall we get" is said concerning the poor, "shall we be able or not" concerning the rich'. Two points, not mentioned in Sp, are added to the explanation in Sp-ṭ: there is a variant *duhitikā*, and this word shows that *du-* and *dvi-* were thought to be interchangeable without affecting the meaning.

Whether the variant *duhitikā* has any rooting in the Vinaya tradition is more than doubtful, for Sāriputta clearly draws from the commentary on the *Samyuttanikāya*:

*dvīhitikā ti jīvissāma nu kho na nu kho jīvissāmā⁶ ti
evampavattātīhitikā. duhitikā ti pi pātho, ayam ev' attho.
dukkham Thitam⁷ ettha, na sakkā koci payogo sukhena
kātun ti duhitikā.⁸ Spk III 106, 13-16 = (Be) III 143,
19-22.*

'*dvīhitikā* means: "shall we live, or shall we not live?" In this way the endeavour is exercised. There is also the reading *duhitikā*. The meaning is the same. "Here endeavour is difficult, it is not possible to undertake anything easily." [This] means *duhitikā*'.

It seems to be rather strange that, in comparison with the text as given in the *Samantapāsādikā*, here *dvi-* is not explained at all. The reason for this becomes clear from *ayam ev' attho* introducing the explanation of *duhitikā*. Thus this commentarial tradition evidently did not know about any other interpretation for *dvīhitikā* than *du(s)-īhitikā*. It is only the subcommentary that brings in *dvidhā* from the Vinaya commentaries: *evampavattātīhitikā ti evam dvidhāpavattātīhitikā. dvīhitikā⁹ dukkarājvitappayogā*, Spk-ṭ (Be) II 382, 24 foll., where the first sentence is quoted from Sp and the second one is identical with Sp-ṭ, both quoted above. Thus there was evidently at the time of the *ṭīkās* a tendency to harmonize different views proposed in the *atthakathā*. The older and correct opinion, that the word begins with *dus-*, prevails in the commentarial tradition of the *Samyuttabhāṇikas* perhaps because of a second phrase occurring only in the *Samyuttanikāya*: *sabhayo c' eso maggo. . . ummaggo ca kummaggo ca duhitiko ca*, S IV 195, 17 foll. 'fearsome. . . is this way. . . a devious track, a wrong path, hard to travel on' (Woodward).

Here the commentary explains: *duhitiko ti ettha ihitī ti iriyānā, dukkhā ihitī etthā ti duhitiko . . . dvīhitiko ti pi patho. es' ev' attho*, Spk III 64, 21-27 = (Be) III 106, 9-14¹⁰ 'duhitika: here endeavour means living.¹¹ Here living is difficult, [this] means duhitika. . . There is also the reading *dvīhitiko*. The meaning is the same'.

Although the original reading *duhitika* is preserved here in both S and Spk, in the Sinhalese and the Burmese manuscript tradition, it is split up into *dū-*, accepted as correct by the Sinhalese, and *dvī-* thought to be the better reading by the Burmese tradition in the *dubbhikkha* formula (S IV 323 foll.) quoted above. As the commentary on that passage has *dvī-* in the *pratīka* against *dū-* in the *mūla-* text of the Sinhalese manuscripts, this proves again the independent traditions of the *Samyuttanikāya* and its commentary,¹² and it proves that *dvīhitikā* belongs to the Burmese tradition. Since the time of Aggavānsa, only *dvīhitikā* has been considered to be correct, for he teaches, when demonstrating different kinds of *sandhis*, that *dvīhitikā* can be split only into *du-*hitikā**, although this word has two meanings: *saṃnapadacchedaṃ asamānattham* Sadd 639, 12 foll., i.e. *du-* stands either for *dus-* or *du-* (= *dvi-*).

It is evident that *dvīhitikā* was preferred to *duhitikā* once the interpretation of this word as containing *-ihitikā* had found universal acceptance. This opinion prevails in the *atthakathā*, which keeps *duhitikā* as a lectio difficilior with the usual laudable piety toward the text tradition. There can be hardly any doubt, however, that *duhitikā* is the original reading. It is not only the text tradition as we have it today that points in this direction, but also the highly artificial, and as far as *duhitikā* is concerned, grammatically impossible interpretation of the commentaries as well as the extremely simple correct analysis of *duhitikā* as *du-hitika*, the counterpart of **su-hitika*. The word *suhita*, though not very frequent, is well attested: *jighacchitānam pi na bhottukamyatā assa pageva suhitānam*, M I 30, 31 foll. 'those who had been hungry would have no desire for food, far less those who had eaten already' (Horner). The commentary has *suhitānam: dhātānam* (Ps I 150, 14), and the *Saddanīti* explains: *titti tapānam paripuṇṇatā suhitātā*, Sadd 449, 23. As the meaning 'satiated' for *suhita* is certain one might infer a meaning 'hungry'

for **duhitā* and 'connected with hunger, stricken by famine' or even only 'difficult to live' for *duhitika*.

It is very difficult to conjecture, however, why and how such an easy and transparent word formation could fall into oblivion, and how the fanciful etymology *du(s)-hitī-ka* could arise. Perhaps the first step was a wrong analysis as *du-hiti-ka* leading to an unexplicable *hiti*, being connected with *Thati, Thita*¹³ just as *brāhmaṇa*¹⁴ was analysed as *brahmaṇ aṇati* (Sp 111, 12 = Sv 244, 10), *bhikkhu* as *samsāre bhayaṇ ikkhati* (Vism (HOS) 5, 6), *ratana* as *ratīm nayati vahati janayati vadḍheti* (Pj I 170, 5 foll.) and many others.¹⁵ The only thing that is certain is that the correct etymology had been forgotten by the time of the *atthakathā*, perhaps even much earlier. For other words of this stock phrase on famine were also misunderstood at a fairly early date as is shown by wrong Sanskritizations.

A formula similar to that in Pali occurs once in the *Divyāvadāna*: *trividham durbhikṣam bhaviṣyati cañcu śvetāsthī śalākāvṛtti ca*, Divy 131, 21 foll.

Edgerton lists in his Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary s.v. *cañcu* a parallel to this sentence from the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*. As the edition of this text by Nalinaksha Dutt is notorious for its numerous mistakes, this passage is retranscribed here from the facsimile edition:¹⁶

tr[v]i[dhāṇ – gap of 27 akṣaras –]/3/manuṣyā vījāni
prakṣṭpya anāgatasatvāpeksayā sthāpayanti yuṣmākam
anena vīj[e]na manusyāḥ kāryam karisyantī idam
samudgasāṇvandhāc cancam¹⁷ ucyat. śvetāsthīx¹⁸ katamah
tasmin kā[l]e [man]uṣyā asthīny upasa [m] (h) r [t] ya [–
gap of 17 akṣaras –]/4/nīti tatas tam pāṇam pviṇti idam
śvetāsthisamvandhāc chvetāsthī ucyate. śalākāvṛttix katamah
tasmin kāle manusyāḥ khalavilebhy (o) dhānyagudakāni
śalākāyā ākṛṣya bahūdakāyām [s] th [ā] lyā [m] kvāthayitvā
pviṇti idam śalākāsanvandh[āt] śalākā [– gap of 7 akṣaras –]
/5/jñā vrahmadattena vārāṇasyām ghaṇṭāvaghoṣāṇam kāritam
śrīvāntu bhavanto vārāṇasīnivāsinah paurāḥ naimittikair
dvādaśavārsikī anāvṛṣṭi vyākṛtā śalākāvṛttir durbhikṣam
bhaviṣyati carṇaśvetāsthī ca, Gilgit Manuscripts III.1
(*Bhaiṣajyavastu*) 250, 9-251, 1 = Facsimile Edition 130b
(= No. 773), 2-5.

It is not necessary here to dwell upon the deviations in wording from the *Divyāvadāna*. But it is noteworthy that here not *cañcu*, but *cañca* is found. This concurs with a second, as yet unidentified, text from Gilgit, which has been published by Sudha Sengupta only recently.¹⁹ As the transcript of this fragment bristles with misreadings to which quite a few printing mistakes have been added, it is useless to reproduce the text here, as no facsimile is available. Whereas *cañcu/cañca*²⁰ is said to signify *samudgaka* ‘basket’ in the *Divyāvadāna* and in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinyaya*, or *za-ma-tog* ‘samudgaka, karañdaka’ in Tibetan,²¹ the Ujjain fragment seems to explain *cañca* as a kind of disease: ‘people fall down on the ground and are unable to rise. They die on the very spot’: *tac cañcenāyam puruṣaḥ kālagataḥ cañcena kālagata iti* ‘therefore they say: “this man died of *cañca*, he died of *cañca*”’.

The possibility of explaining *cañca* in two quite different ways indicates very clearly that the proper meaning was obsolete. Those who conceived the texts knew the formula relating to famine which had been handed down to them as a stock phrase without much caring about the exact meaning of its constituent parts. The same holds good for both the words common to the Sanskrit and the Theravāda tradition: *śvetāsthi/setaṭhika* and *śalākāvṛtti/salākāvutta*. In addition to the material quoted already, there is another famine formula in Pali, in which *dussassa* replaces *dyūhitika*: *dubbhikkham hoti dussassam setaṭhikan salākāvuttam*, A I 160, 15.²² ‘It is hard to get a meal. The crops are bad, afflicted with mildew and grown to mere stubs’ (Woodward).

This translation follows the commentary:

setaṭhikan ti sasse sampajjamāne pāṇakā patanti, tehi viddhattā nikkhantanikkhantāni sālisīsāni setavaññāni honti nissārāni. tam sandhāya vuttam setaṭhikan ti, Mp II 257, 20-22.

‘*setaṭhika*: when the crops are prospering, insects fall on them. Eaten through by them the sprouts of the rice coming up are white and barren. Because of this *setaṭhika* is said’.²³

Although there is a uniform text tradition of *setaṭhika*, corresponding to *śveta-asthika*, in the *Ānguttaranikāya*, the explanation of the *Manorathapūraṇī* and the reading *setaṭika*

in the *pratīka* in Mp (Ce 1922) point in quite a different direction. In spite of the CPD, which sticks to the reading *seta-āṭhika* s.v. *āṭhika*, the correct analysis is *setaṭhi-ka*, confirmed by *setaṭhikā sassarogo* (Abh (Be 1968) 454),²⁴ and by the *āṭhakathā* on the famous comparison demonstrating the disastrous effects of admitting women to the *sangha*:

seyyathāpi Ānanda sampanne sālikkhette setaṭhikā nāma rogajāti nipatati evan tam sālikkhettam na ciratthitikam hoti, Vin II 256, 21-23 = A IV 278, 28-279, 2²⁵

‘Even, Ānanda, as when the disease known as mildew attacks a whole field of rice, that field of rice does not last long’ (Horner).

The text of the commentary, which is identical for the *Vinayapiṭaka* and the *Ānguttaranikāya*, is re-edited here as the PTS editions are faulty in some places:

setaṭhikā nāma rogajāti ti eko pāṇako nālamajjhagatam kāṇḍam vijjhati. yena viddhattā nikkhantam pi sālisīsām khitram gahetum na sakkoti, Sp 1291,5-7 = Mp IV 136, 16-18.²⁶

‘The kind of disease called *setaṭhikā*: an insect eats through a part in the middle of the hollow stalk. Being pierced by it, the sprout of rice cannot draw any water, although having come out of the ground’.

The manuscript tradition and the explanation do not point to any connection with *āṭhi* ‘bone’ neither here nor in A I 160,15. *Āṭhi* ‘disease’ is further corroborated as the original reading by the Samantapāśādikā commenting on the *dyūhitika*-formula. After explaining *sethikā* as ‘although having been begging during the day without receiving anything, [Verañjā] is scattered everywhere with mushroom-coloured bones of dead poor people’, a variant is given:

setaṭhikā ti pi pāṭho. tass' attho setā āṭhi etthā ti setaṭhikā. āṭhi ti āturatā vyādhī rogo. tattha ca sassānam gabbhagahaṇakāle setakarogena upahatam eva pacchinnakhīram agahitatandulam pandarapāṇḍaram sālisīsām vā yavagodhūmasisām vā nik-khamati tasmā setaṭhikā ti vuccati, Sp 175, 4-8.

‘There is also the reading *setaṭhikā*. Its meanings is: “where there is the white disease”, that is *setaṭhikā*. Disease means malady, sickness, illness. And there the sprouts of rice or the sprouts of

barley or wheat are infected at the time of the germination of the crops by the white disease and they grow up quite white without having produced grains, for the water is cut off. Therefore it is called “where there is the white disease”.²⁷

This passage is of particular importance, because it separates *setaṭṭhi* and *setaṭṭi* very clearly, connecting both with different explanations, and because it shows how the reading *setaṭṭhi* might have spread within the Theravāda tradition. Where the context in the canonical texts clearly points to a disease, there is no trace of *aṭṭhi* ‘bone’ to be found in the *aṭṭhakathā*. As soon as the idea of famine arose, the rare word *aṭṭi* was subject to a reinterpretation as *aṭṭhi*. But for the Buddhist Sanskrit *śvetāsthī* one might have been inclined to think of *-aṭṭikā* as the only correct form of the word in Pali.

As the *Divyāvadāna* explains *śvetāsthī* as people collecting bones, cooking them till they are white and then drinking the broth, which is quite different from the *Samantapāśādikā*, this again points to an obsolete word, just like the two different interpretations of *camca* within the tradition of Northern Buddhism. Therefore *śvetāsthī* is suspect of being a wrong Sanskritization of *setaṭṭi*.

The third and last word in this stock phrase on famine, *śalākāvṛtti* is explained in the same way in both the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinyaya*: ‘at that time people scrape together grains and brown sugar from the threshing floor and from spoons²⁸ with the help of sticks. Having cooked this in a lot of water they drink it’. Here again the Theravāda tradition is of a different opinion:

*salākāvuttā ti salākāmattā vuttā. yam tattha vuttam
vapitam tam salākāmattam eva ahosi, phale na janayati,*²⁹
Spk III 106,18-20.

‘*salākāvuttā*: grown to mere sprout. What has been sown here, that became a sprout only. It does not bring forth fruit.’ Here, as at Sp 175, 8-10 and Mp II 257,23 foll., where the same explanation is given in different words, *-vutta* is derived from Sanskrit *upta* ‘sown’. Considering the meaning of the word, which is certainly defined correctly by the *aṭṭhakathā*, and taking into account its Sanskrit counterpart *śalākāvṛtti*, this can hardly be

correct: *salākāvutta* ‘having become a sprout’ is *śalākā-vṛtta*. As a rule *vṛtta* develops into *vatta* in Pali, but *vutta* is also possible.³⁰ This rare, perhaps dialectical, form led the commentator to think of a derivation from *vap*.

The *Samantapāśādikā* further offers a second interpretation of *salākāvṛtti*, supposing this word to signify ‘living on food tickets’. This again shows that there was no universally accepted interpretation of the term, the meaning of which had become altogether obsolete in the Buddhist Sanskrit tradition.

While the explanations of all three words *cañca*, *śvetāsthī*, *śalākāvṛtti* in the famine formula as handed down in Northern Buddhism can be discarded as fanciful, the rather conservative Theravāda tradition on the other hand has preserved the correct meaning of the last two terms.

It is not, however, easily explained how, or if, the spelling *setaṭṭhikā* instead of *setaṭṭikā* intruded into the Pali tradition from outside. The latest date for this development and for the popular etymology connecting *-aṭṭikā* with the word for ‘bone’ is the time of Buddhaghosa.

At a first glance, one might even be inclined to suspect a fifth century Sanskritism. But the dual tradition of *-aṭṭikā* besides *-aṭṭhikā* could have sprung up at a much earlier date, and the frequent misspelling of *ināṭṭa* ‘indebted’ as *ināṭṭha* rather favours the origin of *-aṭṭhikā* in Pali³¹ independent from the Sanskrit tradition.

As *camca* does not occur in Pali, the meaning of the word remains obscure. If, however, the ‘white disease’³² was really thought to be caused by insects, and if the crops were only growing as far as sprouts, perhaps because of the failing rains, *camca* might signify some kind of noxious animal, such as mice or rats, eating the crops. But as there does not seem to be any obvious etymological connection of this word, this guess may well lead us far astray.

Both Northern and Southern Buddhism have preserved this very old stock phrase on famine independently. At the time of the composition of the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinyaya*, the individual members of this formula were devoid of meaning. That is why their Sanskritization was successful in part only, and why their fanciful interpretation was invented. In the

South, on the other hand, a far more authentic tradition was preserved by the usual piety of Buddhaghosa and other commentators to old traditional interpretations, although these were outdated by their own 'modern' approach to the text. It is this respect towards the tradition which enables us in quite a few cases to recover the original meaning of words and to retrace the development of texts.

MAINZ

O. VON HINÜBER

Notes

- 1 Abbreviations follow the system laid down in V. Trenckner-D. Andersen, *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924-1948. I am obliged to my friend K. R. Norman, Cambridge, for some valuable suggestions and for correcting my English.
- 2 The Pāli Tipiṭaka Concordance by mistake gives Vin I 211 and II 175 as references s.v. *dvīhitika*.
- 3 Toev 122. The word is not listed in Childers' dictionary.
- 4 The text of Sp is given here according to the Burmese ChS edition, as the PTS edition is faulty in some minor points. This paragraph is also quoted from a Sinhalese manuscript by Oldenberg in the critical apparatus to his edition (Vin III 268, 4-9); the reading *iriyānipavattanam* shows, by misreading *-nam* as *-ni*, that this manuscript or its source is a transcript from a Burmese manuscript and thus does not reflect a genuine Sinhalese tradition.
- 5 *dukkham . . . duhitikā* is quoted from Spk III 106, 15 foll.
- 6 This second *jiṇvissāma* is not in Be.
- 7 Ee: *Thati*; Be: *Thiti* seems to be a misreading of *-tam* in the Burmese script. The quotation in Sp-‡ has *Thitam*; variants given in Be: *Thati* (sī), *Thāmīti* (syā).
- 8 Ee: *payogena ṭhātūn ti dvīhitikā* is w.r.
- 9 Probably read: *duhitikā*.
- 10 The text is given from Be, as Ee is faulty. For *Thiti* perhaps read *Thitam*, cf. note 7.
- 11 Spk-‡ (Be) II 345, 17: *iriyānā ti vattanā paṭipajjānā*.
- 12 Cf. O.v.H.: 'On the tradition of Pāli texts in India, Ceylon and Burma', in H. Bechert (ed.), *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries*, Göttingen, 1978, pp. 48-57, esp. p. 56.
- 13 A possible 'hyperpalism' **dihitikā* or even **dvihitika*, cf. the pairs *diguṇa* : *duguṇa* at Pj II 497, 31, *dujivha*, *dujivīha* : *dvijivha*, showing a misunderstanding as *dus*: *dūjī-*, or *duvassa*: *dvivassika* (cf. Sadd

796,2), might have been involved in explaining *duhitikā* as *du-īhitika*, if in the pair *duhitika*: **dihitika* the latter was analysed as *dvīhitika* and then assumed to be *-Thitika*. I owe this suggestion to K. R. Norman.

- 14 In different 'etymologies' of *brahmaṇa*: K. R. Norman, *Elders' Verses I*, London, PTS, 1969 p. 167 on verse 221.
- 15 Cf. K. Mitra: 'Fanciful derivation of words', in *IHQ*, 28, 1952, pp. 273-279.
- 16 *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* (Facsimile Edition) reproduced by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra. Part 6, Delhi 1974. As this facsimile was not accessible to Edgerton, he gives the faulty text of Dutt.
- 17 Facsimile not clear: probably not *cañcam*, as *ñc* rarely occurs in the Gilgit manuscripts.
- 18 The letter x is written here to mark the *jihvāmūliya*.
- 19 Sudha Sengupta, 'Fragments from Buddhist Texts', in Ramchandra Pandeya (ed.), *Buddhist Studies in India*, Delhi, Motilal, 1975, pp. 137-208. The passage with a description of famine, which is a blending between the *camca*/śvētāsthī-formula and the *kṛcchra*/kāntāra-formula (cf. BHSD s.v. *kāntāra*), occurs on pp. 202 foll.
- 20 The Gilgit texts show that *camca* is older than *cañcu*, which may be *cañcu*, nom. sg. -u (BHSG § 8.20, 30), originally.
- 21 The Tibetan parallel to the Gilgit text is given by D. R. Shackleton-Bailey, *JRAS*, 1951, pp. 91 foll.
- 22 The positive counterpart is: *subhikkhā hoti susassā sulabhapinḍā sukarā* etc. Vin I 238, 10 foll.
- 23 Woodward's translation of Mp (*Gradual Sayings* II 142 n. 5) is not very accurate. Be has *daṭṭhattā* instead of *viddhattā*, which hardly affects the translation.
- 24 The edition of Abh by Waskāduwe Subhūti (3rd ed. 1900) has -*ṭh-* in the text, but -*ṭṭ-* in the index p. 260.
- 25 Ee has *setaṭṭhikā* in both Vin and A, without variants, but Be and Ce 1933 of Vin and Ce 1915 of A have *setaṭṭikā*.
- 26 Only the more important variants given in the editions are repeated here: *setaṭṭikā*: Sp: so Be with v.1. -*ṭṭh-* in *sī*, *syā*, *ka*, Ee: -*ṭṭh-*; Mp: -*ṭṭh-* in Be and Ee, but -*ṭṭ-* in Ce 1924 and 1904 (= P. in Ee); Sp-‡ (Be) I 426, 19 quotes *setaṭṭikā nāma ekā rogajāti*. -Sp: Ee *pāṇako nāma so*. — *nālāmajjhagatam*: Sp: Ee -*majjhe gamam* = variants in B and K in Mp (Ee); Sp: Be, Ee *nālī*. — *viddhattā*: Mp: Ee = Ce 1924 *viddhā kandā* with v.1. in Ee: *viddhattā vandam*; Be = Ee with v.1. *ka*: *viddhattā kandam*, cf. Mp II 257, 21 quoted above.
- 27 Spk III 106, 17 on S IV 323, 4 has only 'white bones', and consequently no trace of *setaṭṭikā* seems to survive in the *Samyuttanikāya* tradition. Sp-‡ on Sp 175 quotes Sp 1291.
- 28 Div 132, 4 *khala vīlebhyo*; read with Gilg. Man. *khala vīlebhyo* (Dutt *khāla-* is wrong) and cf. Tib.: JRAS 1951, p. 92.
- 29 So read with Be and B₁, C₁ in Ee.
- 30 H. Berger, *Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre*, Kitzinger, München, 1955, pp. 58 foll. -*vutta* is said to mean *nibbattam*, *sampannam* (Vm_v (Be) I 88, 25 foll.).

31 Sanskrit influence, however, is evident in the *Lokapaññatti* 187,15 (ed. E. Denis, Paris 1977) *dubbhikkhaṃ hoti sakalavutti*, thus Denis: 'absence totale de pluie' (sic!); both manuscripts have *satalavutti*, read *salākāvutti*: *-vutti* instead of *-vutta* brings the word near to *śalākāvṛtti*.

32 Probably 'mildew' or 'blight' (as suggested by Oldenberg-Rhys Davids, *Vinaya Texts* III 326) which is, however, not caused by insects, but by fungi.

KECI, 'SOME' IN THE PALI COMMENTARIES

The Pali Canon and its commentaries (cties) are interdependent in so far as the cties give as precise explanations as possible of the vast number of canonical words they comment on in the three piṭakas: Vinaya, Sutta, and Abhidhamma. Both canon and cties are closed now and no further additions can be made to either. Any later explanatory work, such as *ṭīkās*, *anuṭīkās*, or anything more modern or contemporary,¹ does not rank as part of the genuine commentarial literature and is in fact post-commentarial.

The history of this genuine literature is somewhat complicated. It appears to have emanated from Jambudīpa (India), and was brought later to Sri Lanka by Mahā-Mahinda, son of the Emperor Asoka, there to be put into the Sinhalese language. This forms the source-material of the Pali cties as we have them today. For in the fifth and sixth centuries A.D. these ancient cties were not only translated into Pali but organized and edited into a more scientific and sophisticated form principally by Buddhaghosa, Dhammapāla and, to a far lesser extent, by Buddhadatta. All these were bhikkhus living in the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., and all came from India to the Mahāvihāra in Anuradhapura to pursue their self-imposed editorial tasks there with the consent of the resident bhikkhus.

In spite of all that has been written and said, it cannot, so it seems, be repeated too often that not one of these so-called commentators is, strictly speaking, the author of any cty to which his name has been attached. Rather is it the case that all of them were translators and editors rendering into a more acceptable language and arranging in a more co-ordinated and rational order the commentarial material they found at the Mahāvihāra in the Sinhalese tongue. For this, for one thing, 'rendered no service to the bhikkhu-population living overseas'.²

In words attributed to Buddhaghosa, 'Removing the Sīhala language from them (i.e. the cties) and basing it on the *Mahā-āṭhakathā* without discarding whatever are correct meanings and rulings that are given in the *Mahāpaccarī* and other famous commentaries such as the *Kurundī* that can be admitted to the